

Evaluation of the Accreditation System
Professional Services Division
January 2008

Overview of this Report

This report provides an update on the subcommittee work on an evaluation plan for the revised accreditation system.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item. COA discussion will help guide the subcommittee and staff on further work.

Background

The Commission's Common Standard 2—*Unit and Program Evaluation System* reads as follows:

The education unit implements an assessment system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes and utilizes data on candidate and program completion performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, competence, and program effectiveness. Data are analyzed to identify patterns and trends that serve as the basis for programmatic and unit decision-making.

Commission staff suggests that it is appropriate that the accreditation system itself should be subject to a similar expectation as that described in Standard 2 for institutions. As such, any evaluation system developed and implemented for the accreditation system should be sufficient to pass the standard.

At the June 2006 meeting, preliminary ideas for the evaluation system were discussed. Several COA members agreed to serve as a subcommittee to help staff refine and detail an evaluation system. The subcommittee members are: David Madrigal, Dana Griggs, Irma Guzman Wagner, Ed Kujawa, and Sue Teele. The subcommittee met during the October 2007 COA meeting.

The subcommittee noted that there are two layers that need to be considered in the design of the evaluation system. The first layer includes consideration of the following:

- How well are individual accreditation activities working?
- How might individual accreditation activities be adjusted to be more effective?

The second layer includes more comprehensive issues such as the following:

- Does the accreditation system make a difference?
- Are educators better prepared as a result of improvements provoked by accreditation system activities?

The subcommittee also noted that additionally, there are several perspectives that could/should be included in the data collection. Input should be gathered from those who participate in the individual activities, including determining a way to gather information from employers—from those who are at the “user” end of the professional preparation programs.

After the subcommittee discussion, staff developed the following table to illustrate some of the ideas and provide a platform for discussion.

Evaluation of the Accreditation System

How might the COA know if the activities are being <u>implemented successfully</u>?			
Biennial Reports	Program Assessment	Site Visits	System as a Whole
Report to COA to include: *Were reports completed? *Summary information on trends and interesting aspects. *Any proposed changes to the template.	Report to COA to include: *Number and types of reports submitted. *Summary information on trends and interesting findings. *Any proposed changes to the directions.	Reports to COA on each visit as is done now. *Have evaluation forms posted on-line so that feedback can be aggregated and shared.	Include reports of each activity in the Annual Report. Note how the information reported addresses the purposes of accreditation: *Accountability *On-going improvement *Standards *Quality programs Expand the Annual Report to include programs which have been withdrawn or are inactive, new programs, revised standards and transition timeline as well as update.

How might the COA and others know if the accreditation activity <u>made a difference</u>?			
Biennial Reports	Program Assessment	Site Visits	System as a Whole
<p>*Have on-line surveys for feedback from institutions—1 from Program Coordinators and 1 from Deans.</p> <p>*Call together a focus group for feedback at a COA meeting.</p> <p>*At the end of a seven year cycle, select some institutions to see if changes can be tracked from Biennial Reports to Program Assessment to Site Visits.</p>	<p>*Have on-line surveys for feedback from Program Coordinators at institutions.</p> <p>*Call together a focus group for feedback at a COA meeting.</p> <p>* At the end of a seven year cycle, select some institutions to see if changes can be tracked from Biennial Reports to Program Assessment to Site Visits.</p>	<p>*Call together a focus group of Deans who went through the process to talk about changes made at the institution based upon the site visit and other accreditation activities.</p> <p>*At the end of a seven year cycle, select some institutions to see if changes can be tracked from Biennial Reports to Program Assessment to Site Visits.</p>	<p>Survey employers to see if the “end product” – that is, quality educators, is what they are receiving.</p>